



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/661,052

09/12/2003

Berna Erol

015358-009420US

6732

20350 7590 03/03/2009
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

MYINT, DENNIS Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2162

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/03/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/661,052	Applicant(s) EROL ET AL.	
	Examiner DENNIS MYINT	Art Unit 2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7, 9-15, 19-34, 37, 39-45 and 49-83 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7, 9-15, 19-34, 37, 39-45, and 49-83 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 27, 2009, has been entered.

2. The amendment filed on January 27, 2009, has been received and entered. Claims 1-4, 7, 9-15, 19-34, 37, 39-45, and 49-83 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 12, 22, 31, 42, 52, 61, 69, and 78 are independent claims. In the amendment filed on January 27, 2009, claims 5-6, 8, 16-18, 35-36, 38, and 46-48 were cancelled. Claims 1, 9, 12, 31, 42, 61, 69, and 78 were amended. This is a non-final office action.

3. In light of applicant's explanation, rejection of claims 61-83 under 35 U.S.C. 101 in the prior office action is hereby withdrawn.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 19, 39, and 49 are objected to because of the following informalities. Claim 19 recites "The method of claim 18". It is pointed out that claim 18 has been cancelled. As such, claim 19 should depend from an existing

Art Unit: 2162

claim. Claims 39 and 49 similarly recite to depend from cancelled claims.

Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on January 27, 2009, have been considered but are not persuasive.

Referring to rejection of claims 1-5, 7-11, 12-16, 18-21, 31-35, 37-51, 61-72, and 74-77 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), Applicant argued that "*For example, Jasinschi does not involve comparing the recorded information to a source document that is "separate from the recorded information," comparing the recorded and source document, and if a portion of the source document corresponds to a portion of the recorded information, communicate a "translated version of the portion of the source document to at least one device" as recited in Applicants' claim 1 as amended. As discussed of record, Jasinschi segments a video automatically by, in certain stages, comparing portions of a presentation to other portions of the same presentation, such as to distinguish lecture video clips from video of the lecturer*" (Applicant's Argument, page 16 second paragraph).

Examiner respectfully disagrees all of the allegations as argued. Examiner, in his previous office action, gave detail explanation of claimed limitation and pointed out exact locations in the cited prior art. Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification. See MPEP 2111 [R-1] Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation.

During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).

In response it is pointed out that "slides" in Paragraph 0033 of Jasinski are "source information" and "typical lecture presentation" in Paragraph 0033 of Jasinski is "presentation of source information"; Also note that said "video images" in paragraph 0033 of Jasinski are "recorded information". Also note paragraph 0031 of Jasinski for "the videotaped multimedia material", which also is "recorded information" (Jasinski, Paragraph 0027, i.e., *FIG 1. illustrates a block diagram of an exemplary multimedia analysis system 100 for analyzing videotaped multimedia signals*; and Paragraph 0033, i.e., *Controller 130 must **identify the appropriate video images to be used to create a multimedia table of contents.** An advantageous embodiment of the present invention comprises computer software 200 capable of identifying the appropriate **video images** to be used to create a table of contents for the videotaped multimedia material*; Note paragraph 0036 of Jasinski which recites "*a **typical lecture presentation** accompanied by **slides***). "Comparing the recorded information to a source document that is "separate from the recorded information" is taught by Jasinski in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund as follows: "**comparing the recorded information to a (source) document, the**

(source) document being separate from the recorded information and being determined to include information corresponding to at least a portion of the source information presented during the presentation"

(Jasinski, Paragraph 0042, *In the fourth stage, the video clips that are a part of the lecture presentation ("**lecture video clips**") are segmented. The lecture video clips can be segmented by **comparing** them to the video sequences of **the presentation slides, to the head-and-shoulder views of the lecturer, and to the static images**; and Paragraph 0043, i.e., *In an alternate advantageous embodiment of the present invention, an additional fifth stage of the coarse table of contents segmentation may also be performed. In the fifth stage, "combination" images are segmented. A "combination" image is an image that contains more than one type of image. For example, one type of combination image comprises a static image in which a video clip is superimposed on a portion of the static image. A second type of combination image comprises a video clip in which a static image is superimposed on a portion of the video clip. A third type of combination image comprises a video clip in which a presentation slide is superimposed on a portion of the video clip. Other types of combination images are also possible. If no combination images are present, then the fifth stage of the coarse table of contents segmentation is not necessary*); and*

"comparing a source document, the source document being separate from the recorded information and being determined to include information corresponding to at least a portion of the source

Art Unit: 2162

information (during the information)" (Narayana, Paragraph 0048, i.e., *It is to be appreciated that image verification processing can also be performed with the watermark processor 134. It is to further appreciated that image verification processing may also be performed by the remote server in which the image archive 210 and the key archive 212 are located. The watermark processor 134 includes a stamping information extractor for receiving a stamped image from the archive 210 and the corresponding verification key of the stamped image from the secured storage of the keys 212. **The stamped source image** and corresponding verification key are processed by the stamping information extractor module 214 wherein the stamping information embedded on the retrieved stamped image is extracted. **The extracted stamping information 216 and the original stamping information 202 (the recorded camera parameter corresponds to the source image) are provided to a comparator module 218, which compares the extracted stamping information with the originally recorded parameters.** The result of the verification is then provided to a confirmation/warning module 220 to either confirm the authenticity of the image (assuming there is a match between the extracted data and the recorded data) or to warn the user of potential fraud and to take appropriate measures (assuming that there is no match between the extracted data and the recorded data).* Assuming the verification process is performed in the server system at a remote location, such actions may include alerting the system administration of potential abuse as well as restricting the access of images whose content integrity is under investigation).

The limitations “*comparing the recorded and source document, and if a portion of the source document corresponds to a portion of the recorded information, communicate a "translated version of the portion of the source document to at least one device" as recited in Applicants' claim 1 as amended*” taught by Jasinschi in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund as follows: **“determining whether a portion of the (source) document corresponds to a portion of the recorded information, such that a criterion is satisfied”** (Jasinschi, Paragraph 0042-0043; “a criterion” here is the similarity between the lecture presentation (lecture video clips) and either one of the following: the video sequences of the presentation slides, , the head-shoulder views of the presenter, and the static images); **“when the criterion is satisfied, communicating a (translated version) of the portion of the source document to at least one device”** (Jasinschi, Paragraph 0045, i.e., *In particular, after the four stages of the coarse table of contents segmentation have been performed, the video boundaries between the four sets of images must be accurately determined. That is, the video boundaries between the presentation slides, the head-and-shoulder views of the lecturer, the static images, and the lecture video clips, must be accurately located*; Jasinschi, Paragraph 0059, i.e., **After** index module 170 has completed its operations, controller 130 **stores** the resulting table of contents in a table of contents **storage location 260** in memory unit 120). Jasinschi does explicitly teach the limitation: “comparing a source document, the source document being

Art Unit: 2162

separate from the recorded information and being determined to include information corresponding to at least a portion of the source information (during the information)", "performing a determined action when the criterion is satisfied", and "a translated version". Note that Jasinschi teaches comparing documents (i.e., comparing recorded documents) of a presentation. On the other hand, Narayana teaches the limitation: "comparing a source document, the source document being separate from the recorded information and being determined to include information corresponding to at least a portion of the source information (during the information)" (Narayana, Paragraph 0048, i.e., *It is to be appreciated that image verification processing can also be performed with the watermark processor 134. It is to further appreciated that image verification processing may also be performed by the remote server in which the image archive 210 and the key archive 212 are located. The watermark processor 134 includes a stamping information extractor for receiving a stamped image from the archive 210 and the corresponding verification key of the stamped image from the secured storage of the keys 212. The stamped source image and corresponding verification key are processed by the stamping information extractor module 214 wherein the stamping information embedded on the retrieved stamped image is extracted. The extracted stamping information 216 and the original stamping information 202 (the recorded camera parameter corresponds to the source image) are provided to a comparator module 218, which compares the extracted stamping information with the originally recorded parameters. The result of the verification is then provided to a confirmation/warning module 220 to either*

Art Unit: 2162

confirm the authenticity of the image (assuming there is a match between the extracted data and the recorded data) or to warn the user of potential fraud and to take appropriate measures (assuming that there is no match between the extracted data and the recorded data). Assuming the verification process is performed in the server system at a remote location, such actions may include alerting the system administration of potential abuse as well as restricting the access of images whose content integrity is under investigation) and “performing a determined action when the criterion is satisfied” (Narayana, Paragraph 0048, i.e., The result of the verification is then provided to a confirmation/warning module 220 to either confirm the authenticity of the image (assuming there is a match between the extracted data and the recorded data) or to warn the user of potential fraud and to take appropriate measures). Jasinschi in view of Narayana teaches “communicating a portion of the source document”. Jasinschi in view of Narayana does not explicitly teach that said portion of the source document is a “translated version”. On the other hand, Boegelund teaches the limitation:

“communicating a translated portion of the source document to at least

a device” (Boegelund, Paragraph 0042 and Figure 4, i.e. *“the text is then translated to the new language”* and Paragraph 0047). Boegelund teaches a method and system for translating slide presentations into different languages, wherein texts in presentation slides are translated from one language to another and displayed (Boegelund et al., Paragraph 0042 and Figure 4, i.e. *“the text is then translated to the new language.”* and Paragraph 0047). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2162

the to combine the method and system for translating presentation slides from one language to another as taught by Boegelund with the system and method of Jasinschi in view of Narayana so that the combined method and system would constitute the method of claim 4, wherein performing the action comprises communicating a version of a portion of the source document to a device.

Applicant also argued that “ *there is no teaching or suggestion that such a combination would result in a translated version of a portion being outputted to a device if a corresponding portion is found*” (Applicant’s Argument, page 16 third paragraph).

In response, it is pointed out that Boegelund teaches a method and system for translating slide presentations into different languages, wherein texts in presentation slides are translated from one language to another and displayed (Boegelund et al., Paragraph 0042 and Figure 4, i.e. “*the text is then translated to the new language.*” and Paragraph 0047). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the to combine the method and system for translating presentation slides from one language to another as taught by Boegelund with the system and method of Jasinschi in view of Narayana so that the combined method and system would constitute the method of claim 4, wherein performing the action comprises communicating a version of a portion of the source document to a device.

Referring to claims 6, 17, 36, and 73, Applicant argued that “*these claims cannot be rendered obvious by Boegelund either alone or in any combination*

Art Unit: 2162

with Jasinschi and Narayanaswami" (Applicant's argument, Page 17 first paragraph).

In response it is responded that, Jasinschi in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund renders the independent and dependent claims which claims 6, 17, 36, and 73 depend and claims 6, 17, 36, and 73 themselves are rendered obvious by the respective reference cited and discussed in details in the section for the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) below.

In the same vein, Applicant argued that "*claims 22-29, 52-59, and 78-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over Jasinschi, Narayanaswami, and Boegelund in view of Lin (US 2004/0205477). These claims are not rendered obvious by Jasinschi, Narayanaswami, and Boegelund as discussed above. Lin does not make up for the deficiencies in Jasinschi, Narayanaswami, and Boegelund with respect to these claims*" (Applicant's argument, page 17 last paragraph).

In response it is responded that, Jasinschi in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund renders the independent and dependent claims which claims 22-29, 52-59, and 78-82 depend and claims 22-29, 52-59, and 78-82 themselves are rendered obvious by the respective reference cited and discussed in details in the section for the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) below.

In the same vein, Applicant argued that "*claims 30, 60, and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Jasinschi, Narayanaswami, Boegelund, and Lin in view of Smith (US 2004/0205601). These*

Art Unit: 2162

claims are not rendered obvious by Jasinschi, Narayanaswami, Boegelund, and Lin as discussed above. Smith does not make up for the deficiencies in Jasinschi, Narayanaswami, Boegelund, and Lin with respect to these claims. Smith teaches analyzing data files for hidden or embedded" (Applicant's argument, page 18 second paragraph).

In response it is responded that, Jasinschi in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund and further in view of Lin renders the independent and dependent claims which claims 30, 60, and 83 depend and claims 30, 60, and 83 themselves are rendered obvious by the respective reference cited and discussed in details in the section for the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) below.

In view of the above, the examiner contends that all limitations as recited in the claims have been addressed in this Office Action. For the above reasons, Examiner believed that rejection of the last Office Action and Current Office Action are proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2162

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claim 1-4, 7, 9-11, 12-15, 19-21, 31-34, 37, 39-51, and 61-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jasinski et al., (hereinafter "Jasinski", U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0164151) in view of Narayanaswami et al., (hereinafter "Narayana", U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0011684) and further in view of Boegelund et al., (hereinafter "Boegelund", U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0101043).

As per claim 1, Jasinski teaches a method for performing an action (Jasinski, Paragraph 0011, i.e., *method for analyzing the content of videotaped multimedia presentations*) and teaches the limitations:

"accessing recorded information, the recorded information including information recorded during a presentation of source information" (Jasinski, Paragraph 0027, i.e., *FIG 1. illustrates a block diagram*

Art Unit: 2162

*of an exemplary multimedia analysis system 100 for analyzing videotaped multimedia signals; and Paragraph 0033, i.e., Controller 130 must **identify the appropriate video images to be used to create a multimedia table of contents**. An advantageous embodiment of the present invention comprises computer software 200 capable of identifying the appropriate **video images** to be used to create a table of contents for the videotaped multimedia material; Note paragraph 0036 of Jasinski which recites "a **typical lecture presentation** accompanied by **slides**"; Particular note that said "slides" are "source information" and said "typical lecture presentation" is "presentation of source information"; Also note that said "video images" in paragraph 0033 of Jasinski are "recorded information". Also note paragraph 0031 of Jasinski for "the videotaped multimedia material", which also is "record information");*

"comparing the recorded information to a (source) document, the (source) document being separate from the recorded information and being determined to include information corresponding to at least a portion of the source information presented during the presentation"

*(Jasinski, Paragraph 0042, In the fourth stage, the video clips that are a part of the lecture presentation ("**lecture video clips**") are segmented. The lecture video clips can be segmented by **comparing** them to the video sequences of **the presentation slides, to the head-and-shoulder views of the lecturer, and to the static images**; and Paragraph 0043, i.e., In an alternate advantageous embodiment of the present invention, an additional fifth stage of the coarse table*

Art Unit: 2162

of contents segmentation may also be performed. In the fifth stage, "combination" images are segmented. A "combination" image is an image that contains more than one type of image. For example, one type of combination image comprises a static image in which a video clip is superimposed on a portion of the static image. A second type of combination image comprises a video clip in which a static image is superimposed on a portion of the video clip. A third type of combination image comprises a video clip in which a presentation slide is superimposed on a portion of the video clip. Other types of combination images are also possible. If no combination images are present, then the fifth stage of the coarse table of contents segmentation is not necessary);

“determining whether a portion of the (source) document corresponds to a portion of the recorded information, such that a criterion is satisfied” (Jasinski, Paragraph 0042-0043; "a criterion" here is the similarity between the lecture presentation (lecture video clips) and either one of the following: the video sequences of the presentation slides, , the head-shoulder views of the presenter, and the static images);

“when the criterion is satisfied, communicating a (translated version) of the portion of the source document to at least one device”

(Jasinski, Paragraph 0045, i.e., *In particular, **after the four stages of the coarse table of contents segmentation have been performed, the video boundaries between the four sets of images must be accurately determined.** That is, the video boundaries between the presentation slides, the*

Art Unit: 2162

*head-and-shoulder views of the lecturer, the static images, and the lecture video clips, must be accurately located; Jasinschi, Paragraph 0059, i.e., **After** index module 170 has completed its operations, controller 130 **stores** the resulting table of contents in a table of contents **storage location 260** in memory unit 120).*

Jasinschi does explicitly teach the limitation: “comparing a source document, the source document being separate from the recorded information and being determined to include information corresponding to at least a portion of the source information (during the information)”, “performing a determined action when the criterion is satisfied”, and “a translated version”. Note that Jasinschi teaches comparing documents (i.e., comparing recorded documents) of a presentation.

On the other hand, Narayana teaches the limitation:

“comparing a source document, the source document being separate from the recorded information and being determined to include information corresponding to at least a portion of the source information (during the information)” (Narayana, Paragraph 0048, i.e., *It is to be appreciated that image verification processing can also be performed with the watermarker processor 134. It is to further appreciated that image verification processing may also be performed by the remote server in which the image archive 210 and the key archive 212 are located. The watermarker processor 134 includes a stamping information extractor for receiving a stamped image*

Art Unit: 2162

*from the archive 210 and the corresponding verification key of the stamped image from the secured storage of the keys 212. **The stamped source image** and corresponding verification key are processed by the stamping information extractor module 214 wherein the stamping information embedded on the retrieved stamped image is extracted. **The extracted stamping information 216 and the original stamping information 202 (the recorded camera parameter corresponds to the source image) are provided to a comparator module 218, which compares the extracted stamping information with the originally recorded parameters.** The result of the verification is then provided to a confirmation/warning module 220 to either confirm the authenticity of the image (assuming there is a match between the extracted data and the recorded data) or to warn the user of potential fraud and to take appropriate measures (assuming that there is no match between the extracted data and the recorded data).*

Assuming the verification process is performed in the server system at a remote location, such actions may include alerting the system administration of potential abuse as well as restricting the access of images whose content integrity is under investigation) and

“performing a determined action when the criterion is satisfied”

(Narayana, Paragraph 0048, i.e., The result of the verification is then provided to a confirmation/warning module 220 to either confirm the authenticity of the image (assuming there is a match between the extracted data and the recorded data) or to warn the user of potential fraud and to take appropriate measures).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of Jasinschi, which teaches comparing videotaped presentations to source presentations, with the method of Narayana, which also compares recorded information to source presentations and performs an action when a criteria is met, so that the combined method would comprise comparing recorded information to source presentations and perform a determined action when a criteria of comparison is met. One would have been motivated to confirm the authenticity of the recorded information (Narayana Paragraph 0048).

Jasinschi in view of Narayana teaches “communicating a portion of the source document”. Jasinschi in view of Narayana does not explicitly teach that said portion of the source document is a “translated version”.

On the other hand, Boegelund teaches the limitation:

“communicating a translated portion of the source document to at least a device” (Boegelund, Paragraph 0042 and Figure 4, i.e. “*the text is then translated to the new language*” and Paragraph 0047). Boegelund teaches a method and system for translating slide presentations into different languages, wherein texts in presentation slides are translated from one language to another and displayed (Boegelund et al., Paragraph 0042 and Figure 4, i.e. “*the text is then translated to the new language.*” and Paragraph 0047).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the to combine the method and system for translating presentation slides from one language to another as taught by Boegelund with

Art Unit: 2162

the system and method of Jasinschi in view of Narayana so that the combined method and system would constitute the method of claim 4, wherein performing the action comprises communicating a version of a portion of the source document to a device (Boegelund, Paragraph 0042 and 0047 and Lin, Paragraph 0029-0031, i.e. "when the multimedia data object is replayed using a computer controllable display screen and an audio device....."). One would have been motivated to do so in order to "*have a method that can translate presentation slide information from one language to a second language in an efficient and accurate and cost-effective manner*" (Boegelund, Paragraph 0014).

As per claim 2, Jasinschi in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund teaches the limitation:

"wherein the information in the recorded information comprises an image of information outputted from the source document" (Jasinschi, Paragraph 0042-0043, i.e., *In the fourth stage, the video clips that are a part of the lecture presentation ("lecture video clips") are segmented. The lecture video clips can be segmented by **comparing** them to the video sequences of the presentation slides, **to the head-and-shoulder views of the lecturer**, and to the static images).*

As per claim 3, Jasinschi in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund teaches the limitation:

“wherein determining the source document comprises comparing an image in the source document with the image of information outputted from the source document to determine if the image in the source document matches the image of information outputted from the source document” (Jasinski, Paragraph 0042, *In the fourth stage, the video clips that are a part of the lecture presentation ("lecture video clips") are segmented. The lecture video clips can be segmented by **comparing** them to the video sequences of the presentation slides, **to the head-and-shoulder views of the lecturer**, and to the static images; and Paragraph 0043, i.e., *In an alternate advantageous embodiment of the present invention, an additional fifth stage of the coarse table of contents segmentation may also be performed. In the fifth stage, "combination" images are segmented. A "combination" image is an image that contains more than one type of image. For example, one type of combination image comprises a static image in which a video clip is superimposed on a portion of the static image. A second type of combination image comprises a video clip in which a static image is superimposed on a portion of the video clip. A third type of combination image comprises a video clip in which a presentation slide is superimposed on a portion of the video clip. Other types of combination images are also possible. If no combination images are present, then the fifth stage of the coarse table of contents segmentation is not necessary*).*

As per claim 4, Jasinski in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund teaches the limitation:

“wherein the information from the source document comprises an image” (Jasinski, Paragraph 0042-0043).

As per claim 7, Jasinski in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund teaches the limitation:

“wherein determining if the criterion is satisfied comprises: associating information from the recorded information with the information in the source document; and associating the information in the source document with information for the criterion” (Jasinski in view of Narayana, particularly Jasinski, Figure 4, i.e., *TIME, TABLE OF CONTENTS, PRESENTATION SLIDES*, and Paragraph 0030, i.e., *Controller 130 creates a table of contents that displays information that summarizes the content of the videotaped multimedia material. The table of contents generally comprises a combination of video signals, audio signals, and text signals. The table of contents is capable of displaying (1) text, and (2) still video images comprising a single video frame, and (3) moving video images (referred to as a video "clip" or a video "segment") comprising a series of video frames, and (4) text transcribed from audio signals, and (5) any combination thereof.*

As per claim 9, Jasinski in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund teaches the limitation:

“wherein the information associated with the source document is embedded in the source document” (Jasinski, Paragraph 0030, i.e. *text*).

As per claim 10, Jasinski in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund teaches the limitation:

“wherein the recorded information comprises information identifying the information in the source document that has been outputted” (Jasinski, Figure 4).

As per claim 11, Jasinski in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund teaches the limitation:

“wherein the recorded information comprises an identifier, wherein the identifier is used to determine the information in the source document” (Jasinski, Figure 4, i.e., *TIME, TABLE OF CONTENTS, PRESENTATION SLIDES*, and Paragraph 0030).

Claims 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, and 21 are rejected on the same basis as claims 1, 2, 4, 3, 9, 10, and 11 respectively.

Claim 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 39, 40, and 41 are rejected on the same basis as claim 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, and 11 respectively.

Art Unit: 2162

Claims 42, 43, 44, 45, 49, 50, and 51 are rejected on the same basis as claims 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, and 21 respectively.

Claims 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, and 68 are rejected on the same basis as claims 1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, and 11 respectively.

As per claim 65, Jasinski in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund teaches the limitation:

“wherein information for the criterion and action associated with the criterion is associated with the source document” (Jasinski in view of Narayana, Particularly Jasinski, Figure 4 and Jasinski, Figure 4, i.e., *TIME*, *TABLE OF CONTENTS*, *PRESENTATION SLIDES*, and Paragraph 0030, i.e., *Controller 130 creates a table of contents that displays information that summarizes the content of the videotaped multimedia material. The table of contents generally comprises a combination of video signals, audio signals, and text signals. The table of contents is capable of displaying (1) text, and (2) still video images comprising a single video frame, and (3) moving video images (referred to as a video "clip" or a video "segment") comprising a series of video frames, and (4) text transcribed from audio signals, and (5) any combination thereof*).

Claims 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, and 77 are rejected on the same basis as claims 12, 13, 14, 15, 65, 10, 19, 20, and 21 respectively.

9. Claims 22-29, 52-59, and 78-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jasinski in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund and further view of Boegelund and further in view of Lin (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0205477).

As per claim 22, Jasinski in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund teaches the limitations:

“accessing recorded information, the recorded information including information recorded during a presentation of source information from at least one source document separate from the recorded information” (Jasinski, Paragraph 0027, i.e., *FIG 1. illustrates a block diagram of an exemplary multimedia analysis system 100 for analyzing videotaped multimedia signals; and Paragraph 0033, i.e., Controller 130 must identify the appropriate video images to be used to create a multimedia table of contents. An advantageous embodiment of the present invention comprises computer software 200 capable of identifying the appropriate video images to be used to create a table of contents for the videotaped multimedia material*);

“comparing a source document slide in the at least one source document to an image containing in the recorded information, a criteria being satisfied if the source document slide corresponds to the image” (Narayana, Paragraph 0048 in view of Jasinski, Paragraph 0042, *In the fourth stage, the video clips that are a part of the lecture presentation ("lecture video*

Art Unit: 2162

*clips") are segmented. The lecture video clips can be segmented by **comparing** them to the video sequences of the presentation slides, **to the head-and-shoulder views of the lecturer**, and to the static images; and Paragraph 0043); and*

“communicating a translated slide to a device when the criteria is satisfied, the translated slide including a translation of at least a portion of the source document slide,” (Boegelund et al., Paragraph 0042 and Figure 4, i.e. *“the text is then translated to the new language”*, and Paragraph 0047).

Jasinschi in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund does not teach the limitation: “whereby the device is operable to display the translated slide while accessing the portion of the accessed recorded information”.

On the other hand Lin teaches the limitation:

“whereby the device is operable to display the translated slide while accessing the portion of the accessed recorded information” (Lin, Paragraph 0028-0028, i.e. “Synchronization of the overlaid replayable bitstreams...” ; and Paragraph 0029-0031, i.e. *“when the multimedia data object is replayed using a computer controllable display screen and an audio device.....”*).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of displaying a slide while accessing the portion of the accessed recorded information to the method of Jasinschi in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund so that the

Art Unit: 2162

resultant method would display translated slides while accessing the portion of the accessed recorded information. One would have been motivated to do so in order *to produce a replayable recording of the real-time presentation* (Lin, Paragraph 0006).

Referring to claim 23, Jasinschi in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund and further in view of Lin as applied above with regard to claim 22 discloses the invention as claimed. Jasinschi in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund is directed to the method of claim 22, “wherein determining the translated slide comprises translating text of the source document slide to generate the translated slide” (Boegelund et al., Paragraph 0042 and Figure 4, i.e. “the text is then translated to the new language.” and Lin, Paragraph 0028-0028, i.e. “Synchronization of the overlaid replayable bitstreams...”).

Referring to claim 24, Lin in view of Boegelund et al. as applied above with regard to claim 22 discloses the invention as claimed. Lin in view of Boegelund is directed the method of claim 22, wherein determining the translated slide comprises:

“determining a storage location of the translated slide” (Boegelund, Paragraph 0048, i.e. “*storage and retrieval*”); and

“retrieving the translated slide from the storage location”
(Boegelund, Paragraph 0048, i.e. “*storage and retrieval*”).

Art Unit: 2162

Referring to claim 25, Lin in view of Boegelund et al. as applied above with regard to claim 22 discloses the invention as claimed. Lin in view of Boegelund et al. is directed the method of claim 22, “wherein communicating the translated slide to a device comprises causing the translated slide to be displayed on the device” (Lin, Paragraph 0029-0031, i.e. “when the multimedia data object is replayed using a computer controllable display screen and an audio device.....”).

Referring to claim 26, Lin in view of Boegelund et al. as applied above with regard to claim 22 discloses the invention as claimed. Lin in view of Boegelund et al. is directed the method of claim 22, “wherein communicating the translated slide to a device comprises storing the translated slide” (Lin, Paragraph 0029-0031, i.e. “when the multimedia data object is replayed using a computer controllable display screen and an audio device.....”).

Referring to claim 27, Lin in view of Boegelund et al. as applied above with regard to claim 22 discloses the invention as claimed. Lin in view of Boegelund et al. is directed the method of claim 22, “wherein the recorded information comprises an image of an outputted source document slide” (Lin, Paragraph 0025, 0027, 0033 and 0035).

Referring to claim 28, Lin in view of Boegelund et al. as applied above with regard to claim 27 discloses the invention as claimed. Lin in view of Boegelund is

Art Unit: 2162

directed the method of claim 27, “wherein determining the source document slide comprises comparing the image of the outputted source document slide to information in the source document slide to determine if the image of the outputted source document matches the information in the source document slide” (Lin, Paragraph 0028, i.e. “For example, Fig. 1D shows a replayed slide *corresponding* to the captured image of the real-time slide presentation”).

Referring to claim 29, Lin in view of Boegelund et al. as applied above with regard to claim 27 discloses the invention as claimed. Lin in view of Boegelund is directed the method of claim 27, “wherein the recorded information comprises information indicating that the source document slide in the source document has been outputted” (Lin, Paragraph 0025-0028 and 0033-0036).

Claims 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, and 59 are rejected on the same basis as claims 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29 respectively.

Claims 78, 79, 80, 81, and 82 are rejected on the same basis as claims 22, 24, 27, 28, and 29 respectively.

10. Claims 30, 60 and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jasinschi in view of Narayana and further view of Boegelund

Art Unit: 2162

and further in view of Lin and further in view of Smith (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0205601).

Referring to claim 30, Jasinschi in view of Narayana and further view of Boegelund and further in view of Lin as applied to claim 27 above does not explicitly recite that slide number is used to determine the source document slide. However, Smith teaches a method and system for identifying, classifying, extracting and resolving hidden data in slides, wherein slide numbers are used to determine slides in a source document (Smith Paragraph 0073).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of employing slide number to identify/determine slides in a source document as taught by Smith to the method and system of Jasinschi in view of Narayana and further view of Boegelund and further in view of Lin so that, in the resultant method and system, the recorded information would comprise a slide number, wherein the slide number is used to determine the source document slide. One would have been motivated to do so simply because slide numbers are used in the art to identify slides and that has been a well-known method in the art.

Claim 60 is rejected on the same basis as claim 30.

Claim 83 is rejected on the same basis as claim 30.

Contact Information

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis Myint whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 2162

(571) 272-5629. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM
Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the
examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax
phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is
assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from
the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information
for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public
PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through
Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR
system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-
free).

/dennis myint/

Dennis Myint

Examiner

AU-2162

/John Breene/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2162